

## **Principal's Task Force**

# ***Calls for Responsible Press and Distribution Conditions***

The Principal's Task Force on Publications has recommended that student, faculty and other groups assume legal responsibility for publications not written in the University's name and that non-recognized publications both inside and outside the University be tabled at the Dean of Students Office (or equivalent), prior to their distribution at a centre to be established on the mezzanine of the Hall Building. All publications, the report recommended, should carry the names of publisher, editor and printer. The task force also recommended that the community recognize that the governing policy of press freedom is subject to the proper running of the University and its protection from legal liability. The text of the report, soon under study by the University Council on Student Life, follows.

## I. Mandate

Your Task Force was asked to consider the following topics:

1. The status and purpose of newspapers and other publications published or distributed within the University community.
  2. The responsibility and authority of student associations and other bodies for publications published or distributed under their auspices at the University.
  3. Definition of editorial freedom and responsibility.
  4. The control of material offensive to the University community by reason of bias or prejudice associated with race, colour, creed or ethnic origin.
  5. Identification of material that should be treated as confidential in the interest of the University.
  6. Means of affirming the voice of University publications, e.g. establishment of a University Publications Board.

## II. Responsibility

It is recognized that the policies and procedures proposed in this report are subject to the powers vested in the officers of Sir George Williams University to ensure the proper functioning of the University and to protect it from legal liability.

The publications that issue within a university exist in order to serve the university community, and the members of that community have a direct interest in their quality and their effectiveness. The basic requirements for quality and effectiveness are a press that is, on the one hand free and inquiring, and on the other hand reliable and responsible. Within this frame of reference the Task Force endorses the Sir George Williams philosophy of freedom of writing and publication.

Most of the questions referred to this Task Force involve the notion of responsibility. Your Task Force holds that those who write and those who publish do so on their own responsibility. This rule applies to persons outside universities; and it is a sound rule for those within a university community. Student and faculty organizations are responsible for the publications issued under their aegis.

To what extent should the University, as an institution, risk involvement in possible liability for what is written and published by members of the University community, especially in publications by or under the auspices of student, faculty or other organizations that may be said to have a recognized status? The Task Force believes that the University as such should dissociate itself from faculty or student campus newsletters, newspapers, pamphlets or other writings which are not issued under its *imprimatur*. The members of the University community must accept their responsibility without looking to the University as a corporate entity for protection.

The Task Force recommends that this policy regarding publications be empha-

sized by appropriate notice to various campus organizations, such as S.G.W. A.U.T., the various student associations and other faculty and student clubs. We further recommend that the University should require campus publications to carry the names of the faculty or student organizations that sponsor them, and the names of the editors, as well as the names of the printers.

The University is entitled to insist that no faculty member or student presume to write in the name of or on behalf of the University unless properly so authorized.

There is no objection for a faculty member or student identifying himself or herself as a teacher or student of Sir George Williams University, but there should be no overt or covert suggestion of official approval of what is being written, if in fact such approval has not been obtained. The writer should make his or her personal responsibility clear.

There should be no expectation that the University must or will stand behind him or her if civil suit or criminal charges result.

*continued page 2*

## "Explorations Should Go On"

# **Academic Failure but Good Halfway House**

The following is the text of John Macdonald's Ad Hoc Committee on Explorations report on the first year of the experimental program, recently accepted by the Arts Faculty Council. After critical discussion of the report, Council agreed to await the ad hoc committee's recommendations for next year before deciding the future of the experimental program.

It is perhaps unusual to begin a Report to the University with a series of epigraphs. This has been done here with the intention of illustrating the nature of the task facing Explorations I and similar programmes in other Universities. Explorations I was established to fulfil academic ends. While the means envisaged were novel in the Sir George Williams setting, they were not at all so in the general context of university reform; there is nothing remarkable, from the point of view of contemporary educational theory, about interdisciplinary studies, the preference of seminars to lectures, student choice of pro-

ment of the programme. They were able to exert this influence for the following reasons: their cohesiveness as a group (at least as compared with other students in the programme); their more determined articulateness; their constant presence on campus (i.e. 2010 Mackay); their ability to use "peer group pressures" against their fellows. Their effectiveness was considerably enhanced by the lack of consensus among the faculty members associated with the programme, a problem which is still unresolved, and the presence of which led, especially in the early stages, to marked incoherence and a decision va-

Vol. 1, Number 26  
April 27, 1970.

published by  
the information  
office  
sir george  
williams  
university

on their formal courses. On the other hand, a great many students quite obviously did no academic work whatsoever in connection with the programme, and others no more than could have been completed in a week or two of "concentrated" effort.



cuum. Given these circumstances, it is hardly surprising that the programme should have ceased to serve any serious academic function and become instead a predominantly therapeutic exercise for those students who were willing to participate in "a living experience".

# SONGS IN SIGHT 1974

*continued page 4*

## Principal's Task Force

continued from page one

The University itself and all members of the University community are at the same time, as members of the public, entitled to react and take such actions as it or they may be advised, against defamatory or scurrilous attacks in campus publications. Although the Task Force hopes that any complaints, especially on the part of the University itself, will be redressed through the internal grievance and adjudicative procedures, it would emphasize that no administrator or faculty member or student can be precluded from resorting to the civil or criminal law for redress against injury or wrong inflicted by a campus publication.

### III. Publications

On campus one finds a variety of publications with a variety of classes of publisher. Listed below are the five classes of publications with examples of each:

1. Published by the University:

*S.G.W.U. Issue & Events*  
*University Calendars*  
*Student Handbook*, University Council on Student Life

2. Published by recognized segments of the University Community:

*the georgian*, Students Association  
*The Paper*, Evening Students' Association  
*Philosophy Club Newsletter*, S.G.W.U.  
Philosophy Club  
*Dual*, Students' Association  
*Science Newsletter*, Science Students' Association  
*The Bogue*, Engineering Students' Association  
*Commerce Perspective*, Commerce Students' Association

3. Published by non-recognized segments of the University Community:

*The Sir George Student*, The Sir George Student Movement (or Front)

4. Published by individual members of the University Community:

*Edge*, published by Professor Henry Beissel

5. Published by none of the above:

*Other Stand*, Committee for Social Justice in the Middle East  
*Plumbers' Pot*, McGill Engineering Society  
*Uhuru*

The rule that those who write and those who publish do so on their own responsibility applies in all of these cases.

The University as such assumes responsibility only for those publications falling into the first category above.

However, publications that fall into the three last categories are subject to the powers of the University in a different fashion from those which are published by the University, itself, or by recognized segments of the University community. In these instances, the University exercises its authority primarily through the control of their distribution.

### IV. Distribution of Publications on Campus

Apart from the Bookstore, publications are distributed on campus by at least five types of distributor: (1) the University; (2) recognized segments of the University, e.g., the Students' Association, the Evening Students' Association, the Philosophy Club; (3) non-recognized segments of the University, e.g., The Sir George Student Movement, The Sir George Student Front, The Student Workers' Alliance; (4) individual members of the University community; (5) individuals who are not members of the University community.

*S.G.W.U. Issues & Events*, *the georgian*, *The Paper*, and *The Commerce Perspective* are placed in boxes in both buildings, and can be picked up by the students at their pleasure. *Dual* and *Garnet* must be purchased, whereas the *Student Handbook* is given out at registration. These methods of distribution appear satisfactory.

The Task Force has, however, received complaints regarding the methods of distributing on campus publications emanating from non-recognized segments of the University community or persons not belonging to the University.

Put in its most general form, the question that arises is: should any and all individuals and groups be allowed to distribute publications on

campus, or should some control system be instituted?

The Task Force does not wish to interfere unduly with the freedom of individuals and groups, particularly when these are, in some sense, related to the University community. Hence we make four recommendations:

- A. That all publications distributed on campus, apart from those for which the University, itself, is responsible, must carry the names of the publisher or the responsible student organization, the editor, and the printer, and the address of the publication. (This broadens the recommendation presented under section II to cover all publications).
- B. That those distributors defined in Numbers 3, 4 and 5 of Section III be required to table a copy of each publication prior to distribution with the office of the Dean of Students or some other office designated for this purpose.
- C. That the University administrator concerned be directed to refuse distribution facilities whenever the requirements of paragraph A have not been met.
- D. That a distribution stand or kiosk be established on the mezzanine as the only place where all such publications, other than handbills devoted exclusively to announcements of meetings or events, can be distributed.

The purposes of recommendation D are: (a) to provide what is, we have been told, a sorely needed centre for such distribution; (b) to insert some order into the distribution chaos now existing; and (c) to reduce congestion and garbage in the escalator areas.

The procedures outlined above refer to publications that are essentially non-commercial. The sale of commercial publications within the University remains a matter for administrative discretion.

### V. Editorial Freedom

The Task Force was asked to study the definition of editorial freedom and responsibility, and also to make recommendations concerning the control of material offensive to the University community by reason of bias or prejudice associated with race, colour, creed or ethnic origin.

It follows from the philosophy and proposals stated above that editorial freedom should be as complete as the University community will accept. However, since definitions of "good taste" and the like differ widely, and the yardstick of "Community standard" is not static and itself escapes specific definition, the Task Force believes that it would be futile to attempt to lay down firm standards of "good taste" in a university environment. And anything resembling pre-publication censorship should be strictly eschewed.

Fundamental to the responsibility of the press to its community is the open and reliable reporting of news and opinion of interest to that community. There arises out of this the editorial obligation and right to comment freely on persons, events and issues, consonant with the laws of the land. But at the same time individuals responsible for a publication, whether as publisher or editor, should be responsive to the principles and codes of conduct of the community within which they operate. For instance, in the case of this University it is clear that the community will be offended by the publication of any material expressing bias or prejudice related to race, colour, creed or ethnic origin.

Publishers can, and indeed should, make clear to their editors what is libelous or otherwise illegal, and also what in their opinion is offensive to the University community; editors should similarly inform their writers.

### VI. Confidentiality

In general, the Task Force believes that confidential material should be handled within the University community in the same ways that it is handled outside of the campus. Documents which are confidential should be clearly marked "confidential".

In the non-university world, confidential documents and confidential information often come into the hands of the members of the press. As a general rule, members of the press respect all legitimate attempts to keep information confidential. In other words, the press and its public ordinarily work on the basis of mutual trust. Your Task Force holds that such an arrangement is also the most desirable one within the University community.

In addition to the more general question, the Task Force has been asked to consider whether the laying of charges under the socio-academic section of the Code of Student Behaviour should be treated as confidential. Our general position is that it can be important and in the interest of the community to publicize the laying of charges. One of the problems we face at S.G.W.U. is the proliferation of rumour and misinformation, and the media have an important role to fill in ensuring that the facts are made known as widely and rapidly as possible. In addition, publicity could well help to inhibit the laying of frivolous or unreasonable charges. Whether to release to the press information about such charges is, however, a matter of judgment for the Administrator of Codes.

### VII. University Publications Board

The Task Force was asked to comment on the desirability of establishing a University Publications Board.

It follows from our proposals outlined above that we do not see any role for a board exercising regular control of publications on campus. However, we can see a legitimate role for a body which could advise and assist those who produce such publications. Accordingly, we recommend that the University Communications Committee study the advisability of setting up such an advisory body.

### VIII. Recommendations

The Task Force recommends

1. That the University adopt and publish as policy that those who write and those who publish do so on their own responsibility, and the University dissociates itself from faculty or student campus newsletters, newspapers, pamphlets or other writings which are not issued under the University's *imprimatur*;
2. That this policy be emphasized by appropriate notice to various campus organizations, such as S.G.W.A.U.T., the various student associations and other faculty and student clubs;
3. That it be recognized that the governing policy of freedom of writing and publication is subject to the powers vested in the officers of Sir George Williams University to ensure the proper functioning of the University and to protect it from legal liability;
4. That no member of the University community presume to write in the name of or on behalf of the University unless properly so authorized;
5. That any publication distributed on campus, with the exception of those published and distributed by the University itself, be required to carry the names of the publisher-organization that sponsors it, the editor and the printer, and the address of the publication;
6. That publications distributed on campus by non-recognized segments of the University, individual members of the University community (categories 3, 4 and 5 in Section II) be required to table prior to distribution a copy of each publication to be distributed with the office of the Dean of Students, or some other office designated for this purpose;
7. That the University administrator concerned be directed to refuse distribution facilities to the publications covered by recommendation 6 whenever the requirements set out in recommendation 5 have not been met;
8. That a distribution stand or kiosk be established on the mezzanine floor of the Hall Building where all publications referred to in recommendation 6, with the exception of handbills devoted exclusively to announcements of meetings or events, must be distributed;
9. That the University Communications Committee study the advisability of establishing an advisory to assist campus publications.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Stanley G. French (Chairman)  
Mr. Michael Sheldon (Secretary)  
Mr. William Condy  
Mr. Norman Lazare  
Professor Malcolm Foster

# "Biology & Social Change" Sir George, McGill Begin Joint Course

Sir George Williams and McGill will give a joint course- "Biology and Social Change" beginning this September.

The course is designed to acquaint students, primarily in the B.A. program, with the basic principles of biology and at the same time with the relevance of these principles to historical, contemporary, and future social issues. Biological and genetic engineering, pollution, conservation, human ecology, and the quality of life in a technological age will receive prominent attention. The course will make use of lectures, audio-visual aids, and individual and group projects. It is open to both College-Equivalent and University students from McGill and Sir George Williams Universities.

The course instructors are Sir George Humanities of Science professor David Wade Chambers and Genetics professor John Southin of McGill. Professor Chambers is currently engaged in research on early scientific communities in Latin America and the relations of science and imperialism.

Professor Southin since 1963, has been associated with the Genetics Department of McGill University and for the past two summers, has been Visiting Professor at the University of Havana, Cuba.

## **Collegials Up 7%**

4,815 students have applied for the 1970-71 CEGEP-parallel first year program at Sir George Williams University, an increase of 7% over last year. As in the past, many of them are simultaneously applying to other institutions.

Fewer students than last year will be admitted to the program. Registrar Ken Adams said that place will be found for 1,220 first year collegial applicants. Last year 1,587 out of 4,506 were accepted. The drop reflects the leveling-off of the University's CEGEP-parallel program, designed to be withdrawn when sufficient English-language CEGEP's have been set up.

Applications from foreign students for the 1970-71 day division are down from 373 to 266. The reduction appears due primarily to the introduction of the five-year undergraduate program.

In all, 5,738 students have applied for day division studies; 2,020 of them will be accepted.

## **Summer Sees Seven Special Sessions**

Sir George Williams University will offer seven summer sessions of study running from late June through mid-August.

Each institute will feature distinguished visiting professors giving courses during the day for full university credit.

The programs are:

French Summer School (June 22 - July 31)  
Summer Session in Education (June 29 - August 9)

Summer Institutes in Sociology and Philosophy (June 29 - August 7)  
Summer Session in Geography (June 29 - August 9)

Summer Institute for Teachers of English as a Second Language (July 2 - August 13)  
Summer Institute in History (July 6 - August 14)

Summer Institute in English (July 7 - August 18)  
The Summer Institute for Teachers of English as a Second Language, newest of the pro-

grams, is now accredited by the Quebec Department of Education.

The Summer Session in Education will introduce eight new courses for local teachers facing potential declassification.



kind of university do we want to be, do we want professional schools, graduate schools? And we have to see whether or not we are competing directly with other universities, to avoid needless duplication." Within the Arts Faculty itself, Wynne Francis will be working closely with Curriculum Planning Assistant Dean Michel Despland who will try to balance academic needs with resources.

Looking at the new University and its future is the combined job of Wynne Francis' Academic Priorities Committee and the University's counterpart the Academic Priorities Planning and Budget Committee, both of which iron out conflicts between the Arts Faculty and the super-structure of the University, while studying the possible effects of change.

But "reality" seems to be the watchword: "Our most important job is to self-educate the departments, so that they can judge their own needs in relation to others," she said.

## **Bishop Street Bookstore Will Close**

The Board of Governors (April 9) approved reduction of University Bookstore operations to the sale of recommended texts and supplies from the Hall Building Paperback Bookstore and from Birks Hall during the usual September period.

The Bishop Street store will be closed. A task force's first recommendation to hand business over to a contracted bookseller was investigated, but the one tender offered did not prove satisfactory.

Applications are now being received. Last year 1,000 students took part in the sessions.

In addition to the intensive day summer institutes, the University will offer over 100 evening courses from June 1 to July 30.

At this meeting, the Planning Committee reported that talks concerning rental of one or two floors of the YMCA for men's residence facilities were well advanced and that plans were being developed for Birks Hall to meet certain athletic requirements.

The Board approved the use of the University's name in the new students union corporation which will have six directors, two appointed by the Board.

## "Explorations... (continued)

What can be said about possible benefits of a non-academic character, the consideration of which can nevertheless be justified in view of their possible implications for later academic performance? We were hardly surprised to learn that some young people emerging from high school are hostile to adult society, and that others, though more uncertain, feel that they ought to be. Nor is it part of our responsibility to comment on the authenticity or the justice of this hostility (although one reason for the inclusion of the epigraphs is to show that both academics and the political Left -- the two groups from which the rebellious young might normally expect support -- are much less sympathetic than they used to be). We wish to emphasize, however, that the alienation of the young is a social fact with which Universities will have to cope more and more in the years immediately ahead, and that programmes like Explorations I may serve a useful purpose even if they do not confer any very obvious academic benefits on their clients. We were therefore pleased to learn from some students that, having passed through the experience with their "hang-ups", they now felt ready to enter the academic mainstream once more. Indeed, the Chairman was told by a number of students in private discussion that, after the first month or two of the programme, they would have welcomed a more structured approach to problems on the part of faculty members --- and they asserted that their viewpoint was shared by the majority of their fellows. There was thus some indication that Explorations I did function successfully, although unintendedly, as a Halifax House --- to use the term suggested by a member of the Committee --- for one group of students.

Although we did our best to secure firm evidence on a number of important points (see Appendix 2) from Explorations I, we were much less successful than we had hoped. We did, however, obtain enough information of various kinds to enable us to put together a reasonably accurate general account of the programme so far, and in particular to identify its major difficulties. We are therefore willing to make the following recommendations which would be taken less as an indication of our support for the present Explorations I than of our willingness to acknowledge the promise that it represents.

## PART-TIME STAFF CEILING

The Academic Priorities Committee recommended to Arts Faculty Council that there be no increase in part-time faculty appointments and that some existing appointments be redistributed among needy departments. The committee's report explained that the role of part-time staff should be examined in light of the need for more specialized personnel to assume

### Recommendations

- I. That the experiment continue.
- II. That places be found, as before, for 100 students: that up to 50 places be reserved for students now on campus who wish to enter any explorations II programme, and that the remainder be allocated to a second explorations I programme.
- III. That 'the explorers' be again allocated the house at 2010 Mackay, or comparable premises elsewhere.
- IV. That a full-time director of the programme be appointed, preferably from among the faculty members now associated with explorations I.
- V. That consideration be given to the establishment of a separate budget for the programme, to include definite provision for printing and instructional materials.
- VI. That, instead of the present system by which a small number of faculty members are lent to the programme on a three-course load basis, a system be used next year which would allow the participation of a larger number of faculty for a smaller proportion of their official teaching time.
- VII. That the major goals and the essential defining characteristics of the experiment be formulated in advance: that an agreement to participate by a faculty member be held to imply a commitment to respect these goals and characteristics.
- VIII. That the curriculum draw the attention of students not only to the humanities and the social sciences, but also to the natural sciences.
- IX. That the methods employed to select students be clearly in accordance with the goals and characteristics of the experiment.
- X. That grading standards and procedures be formulated in advance, be explicit, and be known to students on admission.
- XI. That an attempt be made to associate members of other faculties with the experiment.
- XII. That, since experiment implies evaluation, a coherent system of evaluation be designed as soon as feasible.

full-time positions and because of the University's stabilized population and uncertainties of budget.

The report was accepted at Council's April 3 meeting.

## SGWU ISSUES & EVENTS

SGWU ISSUES & EVENTS is published weekly by the Information Office of Sir George Williams University, Montreal. The editorial offices are located in room 211 of the Norris Building, 1435 Drummond Street, Montreal 107, Quebec. Telephone 879-2867.

Michael Sheldon  
Malcolm Stone  
Joel McCormick

HELLO-  
GOOD-BYE

Issues & Events will appear during the summer as the occasion warrants.

Weekly publication will resume in September.

## Reading, Riting, Rithmatic, Reagan, Rafferty, PERVERSION

### That 4th 'R' Is Rafferty

By DR. MAX RAFFERTY  
California Superintendent of Public Instruction

SACRAMENTO -- Hoping to get a new and northern perspective on Education and its pressing problems, I whisked up to Canada the other day to clear my mind and settle my stomach. Lo! Upon arriving north of the border, I was splattered with the disconcerting, pie-in-the-face tidings that Sir George Williams University had instituted a new course on "graffiti," which consists of field trips by the students and their kindly professor to various public restrooms in the Greater Montreal neighborhood to inquire into the tired obscenities scribbled thereon by the comfort stations confectioners. The idea, apparently, is that you can learn a lot about human psychology, to say nothing of more exotic inter- and intra-sexual relations, by examining the handwriting on the walls.

Parentetically, this is the first time since Belshazzar's

Feast, to my knowledge, that anyone has been interested in deciphering mirthful penmanship, and certainly the leering literary lewdnesses so carefully chronicled by the William por-

nograpiles can bear little if any resemblance to the majes-

cally foreboding "Mene, mene, tekel, upharsin" so sonorously sounded by Daniel in the pages of the Old Testament.

THE PERVERTS believed with some justification that

they would find a congenial climate at San Jose. They were well aware, for instance, that, according to a recent report in The San Diego Tribune, the college administration there had in 1967 promoted to a full professorship an assistant professor who had just been convicted on a morals charge.

Several other trustees agreed with me, despite the fact that we were promptly and predictably labeled "enemies of academic freedom," "upright bigots" and even "sexual segregationists," presumably because we objected more than somewhat to deceiving these sick unfortunate by according them the same kind of official recognition commonly reserved for Sigma Chi, Skull and Bones and the Audubon Society. Things have reached the point, in fact, where I verily believe an attempt to keep good old Typhoid Mary from moving into a dormitory and serving tables there

would be branded by the campus newspaper as everything

from "obvious discrimination" to "Fascist nonrelevance."

One of my colleagues on the college board accurately called the San Jose situation a "cesspool," and I was desperately hoping for something better and healthier when I

winged my way north. No such luck, alas. It looks as though the Sick Syndrome has surfaced among our Canadian friends even as it has spread like a tropical fungus throughout the American system of higher education.

IF SEXUAL DEViates are to be legitimized and given

official blessings in our schools, why not criminal aberrants, also? It takes no great leap of the imagination, after all, to conjure up approved Mafia meetings, Cosa Nostra clubs or even Murder, Inc. dormitories as our increasingly dithering and futile college presidents scuttle further and further in the direction of stark madness. It is my considered conviction that some of them would try, in the sacred name of academic freedom, to reach a comfortable accommodation with hell itself.

I know exactly how the California taxpayers enjoy hav-

ing their depreciated currency going to subsidize an educa-

tional institution where homosexuals are promoted. The tax-

payer's don't like it, and that's the understatement not only

of the year but of the decade.

What I haven't been able to find out as yet is how the Canadian citizenry is reacting to a university in their most populous city which encourages its instructors to lead their

## 10 The Gazette Times Sunday, April 12, 1970

## Canada Has Her Share of Educational Idiocy in Montreal

### That 4th 'R' Is Rafferty

By DR. MAX RAFFERTY  
California Superintendent of Public Instruction



they would find a congenial climate at San Jose. They were well aware, for instance, that, according to a recent report in The San Diego Tribune, the college administration there had in 1967 promoted to a full professorship an assistant professor who had just been convicted on a morals charge.

Several other trustees agreed with me, despite the fact that we were promptly and predictably labeled "enemies of academic freedom," "upright bigots" and even "sexual segregationists," presumably because we objected more than somewhat to deceiving these sick unfortunate by according them the same kind of official recognition commonly reserved for Sigma Chi, Skull and Bones and the Audubon Society. Things have reached the point, in fact, where I verily believe an attempt to keep good old Typhoid Mary from moving into a dormitory and serving tables there

would be branded by the campus newspaper as everything from "obvious discrimination" to "Fascist nonrelevance."

One of my colleagues on the college board accurately called the San Jose situation a "cesspool," and I was desperately hoping for something better and healthier when I winged my way north. No such luck, alas. It looks as though the Sick Syndrome has surfaced among our Canadian friends even as it has spread like a tropical fungus throughout the American system of higher education.

IF SEXUAL DEViates are to be legitimized and given

official blessings in our schools, why not criminal aberrants, also? It takes no great leap of the imagination, after all, to conjure up approved Mafia meetings, Cosa Nostra clubs or even Murder, Inc. dormitories as our increasingly dithering and futile college presidents scuttle further and further in the direction of stark madness. It is my considered conviction that some of them would try, in the sacred name of academic freedom, to reach a comfortable accommodation with hell itself.

I know exactly how the California taxpayers enjoy hav-

ing their depreciated currency going to subsidize an educa-

tional institution where homosexuals are promoted. The tax-

payer's don't like it, and that's the understatement not only

of the year but of the decade.

What I haven't been able to find out as yet is how the Canadian citizenry is reacting to a university in their most populous city which encourages its instructors to lead their